

A Long-Term Assessment Plan for Indiana: Driving Student Learning

Indiana State Board of Education

November 1, 2006

Table of Contents

Summary

Assignment

System Foundations

Vision

Principles

Structure

Dimensions Common to All Assessments

System Components

Kindergarten to Second Grade: Diagnostic

Third to Eighth Grade: Diagnostic and Summative

High School: End of Course and Post-Secondary Preparation

English Language Proficiency

Implementation

Resource Considerations

Phase-In

Matrix RFP and Timeline

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Process Used To Address HEA 1240

Table 1: The Current System

Table 2: Activities and Timeline for Addressing HEA 1240

Summary

If you are a K-12 student, here is how the system to assess learning in Indiana, once fully implemented, will support your learning as well as measure it:

- In your earliest years (K-2), your teachers will have access to diagnostic tools to engage with you and identify your learning strengths to ensure that you enter third grade ready to learn: reading, using numbers, comprehending and expressing yourself with confidence.
- From third to eighth grade, your teachers will have access to diagnostic tools to assess your progress during the school year across the four core subject areas of English, mathematics, science, and social studies, bringing both acceleration of your learning and remediation into your school year. You will have the opportunity to demonstrate your writing in the second half of each school year and your progress against Indiana's standards in a concise but rigorous summative assessment near the end of the school year.
- In high school, you will be able to confirm the foundation of your preparation for post-secondary education and work through end of course assessments. Algebra I, English 10, Biology, and U.S. History will satisfy the foundation requirements; together with successful completion of one of the Core 40 curricula they will enable your graduation.
- In your junior and senior years, you will confirm your preparation for post-secondary success by taking an assessment aligned to requirements for college and work.
- The results of each of your assessments will be kept in a learning portfolio for you, your teachers, and parents supplemented with other aspects of your work. The portfolio will accompany you as you move in grades and across schools.

If you are a teacher, you will have tools and data for each individual student that respond to Indiana's standards and curricular aims. The data will enable you to align your instruction to each student's developing strengths and issues against the curricular aims. The assessments will help you view each individual student clearly: the K-8 diagnostic assessments during the year and the 3-8 summative assessments at the end of the year will identify each student's level of progress; the end of course assessments will confirm high school student preparation for post-secondary study and work; and the student's learning portfolio will evidence his or her development of individual interest, inquiry and other skills critical for post-secondary success.

If you are a legislator or taxpayer, you will have a system that aligns resources to student learning, provides data in support of teachers' and schools' efforts to enhance student learning and writing, and uses market forces to ensure that the system's vendors use developing practice to provide rigorous, concise, time effective, cost efficient assessments whose results are returned promptly for use in driving student learning.

Assignment

HEA 1240-2006 assigned to the State Board of Education and Department the responsibility to develop a long-term plan for student assessments. The Board was instructed to review the current assessments in grades three through 10 and develop a system that:

- Reflects a student's **proficiency** in and **mastery** of the state's academic standards;
- Is, to the greatest extent possible, **more concise, less time consuming, and less expensive** to administer than the current tests while maintaining the **current level of rigor** of the tests;
- Provides **prompt results** to students, parents, and teachers;
- Explores all options for timing and use of **summative tests**, including giving a summative test in the fall or the spring;
- Measures **individual student growth** from school year to school year;
- Explores all options for **diagnostic tests** for use by teachers to support ongoing remediation;
- Involves a transition to the use of **online testing**;
- Assesses student proficiency in **written communication** in an effective manner; and
- Moves to the use of **online assessments** for Core 40 subjects.

To develop the long term student assessment plan and program, per HEA 1240 the State Board:

- Solicited information from educators, administrators, parents, and the public concerning the program;
- Looked at tests and testing practices in use by or in development by other states;
- Solicited information from testing companies concerning:
 - Parameters and costs of tests;
 - Steps to be taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the tests;
 - Steps to move the longitudinal data from the current testing program to the new testing program; and
 - Any other information the department or the state board considers useful in developing the testing program.

Appendix 1 identifies the process the State Board used, in partnership with the Department, to address the HEA 1240 requirements and create this plan for a new assessment system.

This plan responds to that assignment. It forecasts development over time of a system that will meet legislatively prescribed parameters; align assessment to student learning and mastery of basic curricular aims; and provide teachers with clarity of those aims and assessment results useful to all in determining student progress.

The assessment system will need to be phased in over time. But from the beginning, it should simplify for teachers, parents and communities what Indiana wants our students to master; clarify for them how we will assess the curricular aims that add up to that mastery; and inform them of student learning and progress toward that mastery.

System Foundations

Vision

Indiana's assessment system should lead the world in driving learning for each of our students and in all of our communities.

Principles

There are certain principles that inform this plan:

- **Student learning defines adult life.** Each student's life opportunities, and each community's future, depend on his or her level of actual learning. Learning is rewarded with economic opportunity and improving quality of life; lack of learning is punished in similar measure.
- **There is no typical student.** They have different learning styles, work at different learning levels, arrive from different living conditions, and leave with different life aspirations.
- **Student learning develops over time.** The student beginning to learn in grades K-2 is not the student acquiring fundamental knowledge and critical thinking skills in grades three through eight is not the student beginning to pursue directions and aspirations in high school is not the student leaving high school for further learning and work.
- **An assessment system should be standards driven, student centered, learning focused.** Its curricular aims should prepare the student for post-secondary success. It should serve all students, measuring student performance across the full scale of proficiency and mastery, so that it is relevant for the excelling, achieving, and struggling student alike. It should provide results useful to educators that transfer with the student across grades and between schools and between districts. It should enable DOE or others who provide external assistance to access results and provide recommendations to improve learning.
- **An assessment system should support instruction.** The system should be based on curricular aims that succinctly and clearly describe the desired student mastery of a manageable number of curricular aims and the knowledge content that build directly to post-secondary success. It should enable teachers to understand what they are to teach.
- **An assessment system should help Hoosier communities educate their students.** The curricular aims of the system should support the mission that all Hoosier students graduate with the achievement and skills necessary to succeed in later education and work in an increasingly competitive world. It should be understood by, and be useful to, the state's educators. It should have the express confidence of the state's higher education and employer communities as predicting to success in post-secondary learning and work.
- **An assessment system should be reliable, valid, consistent with assessment standards, and compliant.** It should measure student mastery of and proficiency in Indiana's standards; meet requirements of federal and state law; preserve data from previous ISTEP+ assessments; and enable use of historical data for the student, school and district.
- **An assessment system should be effective and efficient.** It should maintain rigor and integrity; be less intrusive in classrooms; be more integrated with classroom practices; produce results that are returned in a timely manner; enable assessments to be submitted and results to be returned electronically (and, over time, on line); and it should avoid proliferation of assessments for students and teachers.

Structure

This plan recommends an approach to student assessment that is **student-centered and learning-focused** and to that end supports learning-based and data-driven instruction; performance evaluation and improvement; and accountability for educators, schools and school corporations. Its use includes a stronger focus on curricular aims (power standards) and a lesser focus on mere memorization; it is intended to be simpler and more rigorous.

The statewide assessment system should encompass diagnostic assessments, summative assessments, end-of-course assessments, and assessment of student preparation for post-secondary success.

- **In-year diagnostic assessments** (and related professional development support) should be available during the school year to classroom teachers, in reading and comprehension and use of numbers in grades K-2, and in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies/history in grades three through eight.
 - These diagnostic assessments can range from individual student use to interim assessments that monitor student progress.
 - Use of these diagnostic assessments should be optional for schools and local school corporations.
 - The Department should provide a set of instruments that schools and corporations may adopt and use at no cost to them.
 - Schools and corporations may choose to use a system of assessments other than those provided by the state, but costs for such assessments should be borne entirely by the local school or corporation.
- **End-of-year summative assessments** should be administered in English/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies/history in grades three through eight.
 - Annual **writing assessments (both responses and essays)** should be given in grades three through eight in the second half of each school year.
 - Annual **progress assessments that measure key curricular aims, cognitive skills and subject area knowledge** should be given toward the end of each school year.Both of these should be based on curricular aims and content expectations from Indiana's standards. Their scores should be used for accountability purposes.
- **End-of-course summative assessments** should be administered for Core 40 courses in high school. The summative assessments for English 10 and Algebra I should replace the GQE, such that a student who has passed these assessments need take no further state-administered assessments to graduate from high school. Together with the end-of-course assessments for Biology, they should be used for NCLB compliance purposes. Other Core 40 end-of-course assessments should be available to be used for placement in higher education.
- **An assessment to confirm student preparation for post-secondary success** should be offered to students in the fall of grades 11 and 12. The assessment (more than one may be offered) should be relevant to determination of preparation for both post-secondary study and post-secondary work.
- Each student's assessment results should be tracked into his or her **learning portfolio**, which over time would also include other evidence of the student's learning and development progress. The portfolio would track to the student's testing number for portability vertically through the grades and horizontally across schools and districts.

STUDENT LEARNING PORTFOLIO



Grades 11-12

POST-SECONDARY PREPARATION ASSESSMENT

Grades 9-12

CORE 40 END-OF-COURSE ASSESSMENTS

[ALGEBRA I AND ENGLISH 10 - REPLACE THE GQE]

[ALGEBRA I, ENGLISH 10, AND BIOLOGY I - MEET NCLB REQUIREMENTS]

[MATHEMATICS, ENGLISH, SCIENCE, AND SOCIAL STUDIES - SUPPORT CORE 40 DIPLOMAS]



Student Counseling and Career



Grades 3-8

END-OF-YEAR SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

[ENGLISH, MATH, SCIENCE, and SOCIAL STUDIES]

2ND SEMESTER WRITING ASSESSMENT

END-OF-YEAR PROGRESS ASSESSMENT

Grades 3-8

Voluntary In-Year Diagnostic Assessments

[English, Mathematics, Sciences, and Social Studies]



Grades K-2

School building level confirmation of student reading level at the end of second grade

Voluntary In-Year Diagnostic Assessments

[Reading, Use of Numbers, and Comprehension]

Dimensions Common To All Assessments

The assessments at all levels should share these dimensions:

PURPOSE

- They should drive student learning; support high quality instruction for learning; evaluate individual issues and abilities in student learning and adjust instruction accordingly; and provide continual and periodic data that defines student progress.

ALIGNMENT

- They should **align to the curricular aims of Indiana’s academic standards**. Because the purposes of the assessments are to support student learning, provide feedback for instruction, and assess student progress, these assessments should align to and draw from the curricular aims and standards in the relevant content areas at each grade level and in each course. The curricular aims—what some call power standards—should clarify a manageable number of demonstrated competencies and masteries that link the content of the standards to the development of skills needed for post-secondary success. These communicate to educators and other education stakeholders, such as students, parents, community members, and policy-makers, the “end-of-the-day” expectations for students that correspond to the scores from the assessments.
- They should build to **a system that is aligned vertically** across grades and learning levels by confirming linkage to standards and aims at each level of learning.
- There should be **a high positive correlation with externally mandated tests** such as NAEP, TIMMS, PISA, Advanced Placement, and other examinations that Indiana should participate in fully and students should have access to without conflict with Indiana’s assessments.

CONSISTENCY

- They should feed results on an individual basis **tied to each student’s testing number**. For assessment results to be reported and used effectively, they must be linked with other student-level information that is used to support instruction, evaluation, and research. The Department has developed a student information management system that includes a unique identification number for every student; this number is used to connect assessment data to other information required for state and federal reporting and participation in special education services or English as a Second Language or bilingual education services.
- They should build comprehensively into a **learning portfolio** for each student.
- They should allow crosswalks for **continued longitudinal use of the prior results** of ISTEP+ deemed relevant to future assessments.

USEFULNESS

- They should meet the APA-NCME-AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, such that they produce **results that are valid and reliable and data of useful quality**.
- They should **have full rigor** in their administration, in the calculation of their raw results, in any conversion of raw results to reported results, and in the reporting of their results.
- They should enable assessment of and visibility to the **full spiral of possible learning results**, not just locked within a single grade level grade or average course content, so they are relevant to the accelerated, average, and struggling learner alike.
- Their results should be **reported in a simple, understandable format** useful to teachers, parents, and community leaders alike.
- Their results should **feed and drive the educational decisions** in each classroom, school and district, across the range of perspectives: they should **meet NCLB and PL 221 requirements**; they should **facilitate closing achievement gaps** for individual students and for students viewed demographically; and they should **drive toward higher educational achievement** for all students across the full height and breadth of student performance.
- Their usage should be **valid at the classroom level**, to inform and guide instruction. The results should help teachers know—student-by-student and collectively—how to adjust instruction to drive learning.

TECHNOLOGY

- They should **take advantage of developing technology** to administer and grade the assessments using an online platform with print technology, phased in so that over time the process used is an on-line process to the maximum extent possible. This can reduce the time necessary for scoring and reporting assessment results as well as the burden on local staff, who must organize, administer, and collect documents associated with paper-and-pencil administrations. In addition, interactions with computer technologies are a common and highly valued aspect of students' educational experiences. Therefore, to take advantage of the efficiencies and educational benefits associated with computer-delivered assessments, the components should migrate to electronic administration as the primary form. During the transition, the assessment instruments should be administered primarily in electronic form and in paper-and-pencil form as needed. Because assessments that are administered on the computer may pose inappropriate challenges for some students with specific disabilities, alternate forms and testing accommodations must be provided as required by state and federal law.
- They should **maintain confidentiality** of results for each student. The Department and schools are bound by state and federal regulations protecting the confidentiality of any and all student-level information that it collects and maintains.

IMPLEMENTATION

- They should be **prioritized and phased in** consistently with fiscally responsible, logistical, developmental, and legal parameters.

- They should be based on an operating approach that has **DOE’s assessment leadership as the core partner in interlocking partnerships** with vendors as needed to oversee the system.
- They should be **acquired through a competitive process**, both horizontally within any assessment and vertically across all, that enables maximum taxpayer value for the products and services delivered. The competitive process should enable vendors to bid on a piece or part or all of the system, maximizing the opportunity for a system that provides valid, reliable, and useful results for reasonable investment.
- That competitive RFP process should **enable the state to see the possibilities** for continued rigor in expectation, shorter time from assessment to result, and reduced cost, with the goal of prioritizing resources toward the diagnostics that drive student learning.
- They should explore **use of vendor capacity** to host diagnostics in the early years, with the option to continue to host or shift to the state over time. This would help implement immediately a basic platform available 24x7, with usage of the system based on matrix pricing (for example, up to a specified number of students/year across all subjects, and then be scalable at lower costs by both the number of students using and subject areas tested, so the state only pays for what is used).
- They should induce vendor agreement to add questions to **an Indiana-specific bank of items** by grade and subject area, which Indiana over time can own, including items that local districts have self-developed and could be used statewide if otherwise valid and relevant.

DOE SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE

- They should **enable the Department to rise to a capacity to assist and support local districts** through collection and data analysis of the results of the assessments, and related support for schools, rather than self-development and administration of them. To ask the Department to build their own tests does not work: the cost, constant changes, time of development and similar factors preclude a timely and cost-effective process. A “managing partner” role, in partnership with one or more external vendors, is best, with the Department as control point, subject to state board oversight, so that we do not have to build our own but we can be satisfied that linkage, validity, reliability, and other critical factors exist and we can build off the vendors (and their item banks) subject to their alignment to Indiana’s standards. The science and practice of assessments and technology related to them is developing in a manner and at a pace that enables the Department to use vendors for leverage and dedicate its resource base to analysis and support.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- For some students with disabilities and some English language learners, classroom educators may apply appropriate accommodations during testing that reflect approaches that are used in instruction.

System Components

Kindergarten to Second Grade: Diagnostic

Assessments for grades K-2 should drive learning by focusing on the child's *ability to read, comprehend, and use numbers*.

- The assessments should be **diagnostic**, not part of an accountability system, supporting the student's teachers' understanding of his or her individual circumstances. Teachers, schools, and corporations should have access to a system that provides inquiries, evaluates student responses, identifies learning results and issues, and delivers professional development resources for student literacy and numeracy skills.
- The assessments should be **classroom based**, focused on identifying individual learning needs and issues, and enabling effective conclusions about students that can be translated into child-specific activity. They should inform professional development and provide a structure and process for teachers to share measurement and evaluation techniques that can be embedded in instruction.
- The assessments should be **effective for all children**: usage of the results of the assessments should further encourage the advanced and gifted child, drive progress in the student who is ready, and accelerate progress for the student whose learning reflects gaps in preparation and readiness.
- The assessments should be **technology enabled**.
- The assessments should be **locally managed**. Their use should be determined as desired at the local level. The administration, frequency, and use of the assessment capabilities—spot use, organized periodic use, and/or mid-year interim evaluation—and results should be local decisions.
- The assessments should be **made available at the state's expense**. This will drive consistency in use; creation of common references, communities of practice and focused professional development; stimulation of supporting technical assistance; and leverage in costs of acquisition, deployment, and use. Each individual community should retain the ability to opt out of the system at its own local expense (without state subsidy) if it prefers a different diagnostic assessment methodology for these grades.
- Local school corporations should submit data from these assessments to the state department of education, to be used for individual student learning record purposes and support and research purposes but not for accountability purposes.
- The results of such assessments should be **part of the student's learning portfolio**, recorded and made available so that as students move grade-to-grade or school-to-school their development history moves with them.

At the end of second grade, students' basic literacy, numeracy, and comprehension should be determined at the school building level. The school will place the individual student determination in the student's learning portfolio and also report to the state the percent of students reading above, at and below grade level. The assessment used for this purpose will be for data only and not used for accountability in the second grade.

Third to Eighth Grade: Diagnostic and Summative

Assessments in English, mathematics, science, and history for grades 3-8 should be divided between *in-year diagnostic assessments* and *end-of-year summative assessments*. In-year diagnostic assessments should be used in classrooms during the school year to drive learning and summative assessments should be used toward the end of the year to measure student performance and growth.

In-Year Diagnostic Assessments

- The diagnostics assessments should **inform instruction**.
- They should be **embedded in classroom practice**, as an approach to teaching rather than just a test instrument. They should provide immediate feedback, so that they have maximum application to drive student instruction and learning. Specific feedback with suggestions for instruction should be part of every individual student report.
- They should **identify individual learning progress**. They should enable effective conclusions about students that can be translated into activity that further encourages the advanced and gifted child, drives progress in the student who is ready, and accelerates progress for the student whose learning reflects gaps in preparation and readiness.
- The assessments should provide **diagnostic information** (i.e., so teachers know why the student got the question wrong). They should identify alerts as to individual progress toward end-of-year expectations. They should provide benchmarks to identify students who are not on track for meeting end-of-year grade expectations
- They should be **aligned with state standards and curricular aims**. They should be targeted to and reflect the rigor of defined subject matter consistent with applicable Indiana standards, so that they induce confidence that results on the diagnostic assessment will predict to results on the summative assessment.
- The assessments should be **technology enabled**. They should be able to be administered electronically and online.
- The assessments should be **locally managed**. Their use should be determined as desired at the local level. The administration, frequency, and use of the assessment capabilities—spot use, organized periodic use, and/or mid-year interim evaluation – and results should be local decisions.
- The assessments should be **flexible in use**, available as needed by the teacher for whole classroom or individual student application.
- The assessments should **measure across the full scale of learning**, float both above and below grade level (grade-less), so that the teacher can apply them to assist students working well above or below as well as those tracking to grade level expectations.
- The assessments should **support the collection of student performance data** that enables longitudinal visibility to each student's growth in each area during the school year, continuity of that visibility as a student passes from teacher to teacher, and collective visibility of the student's performance during a year by all the teachers responsible for the student's learning.
- The **student portfolio and tracking system** should enable (although not require) the cross-classroom and community of practice use of diagnostic results during each student's year, as well as reference to other indicators of student performance (portfolios, specific assistance, etc.).

- Local school corporations should submit data from these assessments to the state department of education, to be used for individual student learning record purposes and support and research purposes but not for accountability purposes.
- The reported results should **enable easy use by the teacher in conferring with the student's parents about the student's progress**. Collective classroom results can be reported and used as desired by the local community, district or school, but the state's interest is served best by providing diagnostic assessments that focus on the individual student's learning.
- These assessments should be **available statewide and at the state's expense**: this will drive consistency in use; creation of common references, communities of practice and focused professional development; stimulation of supporting technical assistance; and leverage in costs of acquisition, deployment, and use. Each individual community should retain the ability to opt out of the choices offered by the state at its own local expense (without state subsidy) if it prefers a different diagnostic assessment methodology for these grades.
- Schools should be free to use diagnostic means of their own choosing to **assess student writing** during the school year.

End-of-Year Summative Assessments

These assessments for grades three through eight should contain both a **writing assessment** and a **progress assessment**. All students in grades three through eight should take the writing and progress assessments, with appropriate accommodations and alternate assessment instruments to support full access for eligible students with disabilities and English language learners. The results should be reported by the end of the school year and in a format that facilitate timely communication for parental awareness of annual student performance and progress, teacher reflection and planning, student use of summer for remediation or further learning, and overall collective community reflection on school results.

The writing assessment

- Should be **understood by community and school leaders** as critical to student success.
- Should be **administered annually in the second half of each school year**, so the reporting of its results can be synchronized with the reporting of the progress assessment by the end of the school year. This enables an integrated report in a timely and useful fashion to inform parents, teachers, schools, and communities of student proficiency in writing and student progress in English, mathematics, science and social studies.
- Should use Indiana's standards to create **essay and other open-ended questions** that measure student use of grammar and composition for effective writing, higher-order thinking, and applied skills.
- Should be **defined, scored, paid for, and reported by the state**.
- The method of scoring should be determined through the RFP process, to maximize the possible means used to produce **timely, valid, reliable, and cost-effective results**.
- Savings from less expensive scoring should be used for grade three through eight diagnostic assessments and professional development in writing.
- Should be **scored uniformly** across the state, with scoring that **expects rigor** in student grammar, composition, and written expression.

- To give effect to the importance of writing, each student's writing score should be reported as **a separate result** focused on each student's writing ability.
- Should have its **results reported** annually to parents, teachers, and school and community leaders, at the same time as the progress assessment results.
- Should be **tracked by individual student testing number**, so that the results are both portable over geography (as the student moves from school to school or district to district) and available over time (as the student rises through K-12 grades to graduation and ultimately into post-secondary education).
- Should be **used by teachers and schools** to inform teacher professional development and school culture and expectation.
- Should become **part of each student's learning portfolio**, which should evidence the student's progress to effective written expression.
- Should be reported by school and district.

The progress assessment

- Should reflect **each student's growth** during the school year.
- Should be given **annually in English and mathematics** and **every other year in science and social studies**.
- Should measure **the curricular aims** reflected in Indiana's standards for the subject areas assessed—English, mathematics, science and social studies—rather than the details of factual knowledge, freeing teachers as well to focus on the curricular aims and eliminating motivation and ability to game the system.
- Should apply **the rigor expected** in those curricular aims and standards, in the knowledge and skills assessed, in determining the actual results by student and in the aggregate, and in the reporting of such results to the teacher, school, parents and community.
- By addressing curricular aims and applying rigor, should **meet the expectations of NCLB**.
- Should **build cumulatively**, within and across subject matter areas, reflecting the developmental progressions across grades three through eight with tests aligned to the curricular aims and standards toward the ultimate goal of student preparation for success in high school work.
- Should be **shorter in time to take**. The administration of assessments for each subject area need not be contiguous, but they should be concise in time to take, in the context of adequate technical rigor and quality necessary to meet federal or other applicable standards.
- Should have **no open ended or essay questions** but should use other means to assess higher order thinking skills and curricular aims.
- Should be **structured to save resources at the local level**, freeing local resources to focus on students, instruction, and guidance.
- Should be **administered near the end of the school year**, with only a brief turn-around time so that scores are received before the end of the school year. This enables them to be less intrusive on teaching during the year.
- The format of the assessments should enable **electronic administration and scoring** and provide compatibility to move to online assessments when such capacity exists.
- The method of scoring should be determined through the RFP process, to maximize the possible means used to produce **timely, valid, reliable, and cost-effective results**.
- Should be **tracked by individual student testing number**, so that the results are both portable over geography (as the student moves from school to school or district to district)

and available over time (as the student rises through K-12 grades to graduation and ultimately into post-secondary education).

- Should become **part of each student's learning portfolio**, which should evidence the student's progress to proficiency in the curricular aims.
- Should be **reported by school and district**.

The end-of-year summative assessments should have the validity, reliability and other attributes adequate for use in the state's (PL 221) and the federal government's (NCLB) systems of tracking student performance. Data from previous summative assessments should be retained and brought into the system by cross-walking results from earlier assessments into the system.

High School: End-of-Course and Post-Secondary Preparation

Assessments in high school should include both *end of course assessments* and an *assessment that identifies student preparation for success in post-secondary learning and work*.

End of Course Assessments

- These assessments should be **given in each of the basic Core 40 course areas** (English, mathematics, science, and social studies).
- They should reflect both **the rigor of the state's standards and preparation for post-secondary study** in such subjects. The assessments should be of such rigor as to enable institutions of higher education to use them for student placement there.
- The assessments should be **given at the end of the course taken**, whether it is during the spring or fall semester.
- **All students taking the course should take the assessment.** There should be no bar to prevent a student not in the course but whose other experience indicates the appropriateness of taking the assessment from participating. Where students take an Advanced Placement course in a course that has an end of course assessment, they should not have to take the end of course assessment and the AP result should be noted in its stead.
- The format of the assessments should enable **electronic administration and scoring** and provide compatibility to move to online assessments when such capacity exists.
- **Local decision** should determine whether the assessment is used in whole or part to determine the student's grade in the course.
- Over time, student success on these assessments should be recognized and rewarded by the state.
- The **results of the assessment** should be reported to the student's parents, be part of the student's transcript, and be included in the student's learning portfolio.
- The results of the assessments should be used to confirm student difficulty with, proficiency in or mastery of the subject matter of the course and thus to assist in **student course selection, counseling and career planning** (and if needed remediation) through high school.
- **The GQE should be replaced by student success in end-of-course assessments in Algebra I and English 10.** Students should have the same right to retake these assessments if they do not pass them as currently exists under the GQE.

- End-of-course assessments in **Algebra I, English 10, and Biology I will be required of all students to meet current NCLB requirements** for high school assessments.
- All students must take end-of-course assessments in mathematics, English, science, and social studies courses; their scores will be reported on their transcripts and used to qualify for diploma endorsements; with the expectation that over time the results will be used in awarding Core 40 diplomas.
- In appropriate courses or areas (for example, **government and financial literacy**), end-of-course assessments should be provided for local use to support confirmation of student proficiency in such areas.
- Students should be able to **bank ECA scores taken prior to high school**.
- **Further end-of-course assessments could be developed over time** for courses in grades 11 and 12 that have targeted use for such an assessment. They could be provided, for example, in courses relevant to career technical education subject areas; to enable a student to demonstrate specific proficiency adequate for placement in post-secondary study or for confirmation of ability to enter in specific post-secondary work. Use of these assessments should be voluntary at the local level.
- Local schools, districts, and communities should continue to own the development of their **students' written expression** through their high school years. Course assignments and examinations during the year, project based learning and other locally determined curricular contexts provide ample opportunity for assessment of each student's thinking and writing.
- Should be **tracked by individual student testing number**, so that the results are both portable over geography (as the student moves from school to school or district to district) and available over time (as the student rises through K-12 grades to graduation and ultimately into post-secondary education).
- Should become **part of each student's learning portfolio**, which should evidence the student's progress to proficiency in the curricular aims.
- Should be **reported by school and district**.

Post-Secondary Preparation Assessments

- **All students should take the assessment.** For students who have an interest post-secondary education, the assessment should measure preparation for success there. For students who have an interest in technical education, the assessment either should be calibrated to also gauge readiness for such work, or a different assessment more compatible with technical education should be offered as a second part of the student's assessment.
- This assessment should **confirm student preparation for success** in post-secondary activity, whether that is further study or work. The assessment should be of such a rigor and nature as to be portable across not only post-secondary opportunities in Indiana but also those elsewhere in the country. It should strengthen the currency of the Hoosier high school diploma.
- The assessment should be **useful to decisions by students and their families**, for counseling and decisions concerning post-secondary directions and aspirations. It should be offered to sophomore and junior students as a means to inform them and their parents of their learning status vis-à-vis' expectations for success post-high school and to establish a context for academic counseling and education/career planning. The assessment should be available to

and required of all seniors, unless they have achieved a result on the assessment in an earlier year that is adequate to define and maximize post-secondary opportunities.

- The assessment should be **useful to decisions by post-secondary institutions of higher education and employers**. It should support their decisions to admit and place students or to hire and place employees.
- The assessment should **supplement and not replace the other requirements for a high school diploma**. The assessment (along with appropriate end of course assessments) should replace the GQE, which measures only minimal proficiency against grade nine expectations, not preparation for success in post-secondary study, work and life.
- The assessment should be **tracked by individual student testing number**, so that the results are both portable over geography (as the student moves from school to school or district to district) and available over time (as the student rises through K-12 grades to graduation and ultimately into post-secondary education).
- The assessment should become **part of each student's learning portfolio**, which should evidence the student's progress to proficiency in the curricular aims.
- The assessment should be **reported by school and district**.

English Language Proficiency

The Department will still need to access and deliver assessments to *gauge student proficiency in English* as required by federal and state law. Such assessments should:

- Be taken by all students enrolled in English as a Second Language or bilingual education services in grades K-12, upon enrollment and at the end of each school year, thereafter or until the students demonstrate proficiency
- Yield scores for program evaluation and accountability purposes at the school, local school corporation, and state levels
- Be provided by the state using centralized collection, scoring and reporting services
- Be supported through provision of electronic reports and software to support the interpretation and local use of assessment results
- Provide assessment data for use in accountability calculations at the local school corporation and state levels; all accountability analyses and reporting should be conducted by the state

Students with Disabilities

The Department will still need to access and deliver *alternative assessments for students with disabilities* as required by federal and state law. Such assessments should:

- Be taken by all such students in each school year where summative assessments are required
- Yield scores for program evaluation and accountability purposes at the school, local school corporation, and state levels
- Be provided by the state using centralized collection, scoring and reporting services
- Be supported through provision of electronic reports and software to support the interpretation and local use of assessment results
- Provide assessment data for use in accountability calculations at the local school corporation and state levels; all accountability analyses and reporting should be conducted by the state

Implementation

Resource Considerations

Necessary resources for the assessment system fall into multiple categories:

The **financial resources** to procure and administer the various assessments: these resources should come from the state, including for the menu of diagnostic assessments, except where local decisions adopt an approach different from the state's menu for diagnostic assessments, in which case local resources unsubsidized by the state should be used. The resources required should be reduced in amount by statewide competitive bidding. These may or may not require financial resources beyond those currently allocated by the General Assembly.

The **department resources** necessary to direct the overall system: from administration of the assessments to management of the data to reporting the results, these should be adequate to the task, across the system. These will require resources in excess of those currently available to Dr. Reed and Dr. Bruce.

The **professional development** driven by the results of the summative assessments should remain a matter for local decision, with community of practice opportunities facilitated by resources from the department, universities, and other sources. The existing district and school planning mechanisms, supplemented by learning resources made available from the state and assessment vendors, should be adequate to train up local educators in the administration of the assessments.

Phase-In

For a variety of purposes—financial capacity, effective implementation, validity and reliability, opportunity to learn, and others—a plan should be developed to phase in the elements of this overall system. That plan could be accelerated or deferred depending on vendor responses to requests for proposals and the system components and costs such responses may enable or require. Transition requirements also should be considered. In general, the phase-in should look like this:

Phase 1:

- Grades three through eight, summative and diagnostic assessments
- High school end-of-course assessments to replace the GQE (Algebra I and English 10) to meet NCLB requirements (Algebra I, English 10 and Biology I) and to support Core 40 diplomas (mathematics, English, science, and social studies)

Phase 2:

- Grades K-2 diagnostic assessments
- Post-secondary preparation assessments

Phase 3: Other high school end-of-course assessments

Matrix RFP and Timeline

To ensure exploration of maximum opportunity for success in building the system components at lowest reasonable cost, the potential components of the assessment system should be packaged in an RFP that allows each vendor to determine whether to bid on the entire package, selected components or a single component; whether to bid in isolation or in cooperation with other vendors; etc., and allows the state to determine with which vendors to contract and for which portions of the system.

The timeline for the RFP should be as follows:

November 2006:	Refine plan specifics Develop the RFP for State Board review & approval
December 2006:	Hold interested vendors conference Issue RFP
January-February 2007:	RFP period
March 2007 on:	Negotiations and decisions

Appendices

Appendix 1: A Report on the Process Used to Address HEA 1240

HEA 1240 provided the Indiana State Board of Education (ISBE) with a unique opportunity to revisit Indiana's approach to student assessment within the contexts of education reform; state and federal standards, assessment, and accountability policies; and the professional standards for educational testing. By grounding its response to HEA 1240 in these contexts, the ISBE has developed a coherent plan for student assessment that can be integrated within the broader educational system that it must serve and help to improve.

The first steps in the HEA 1240 process involved the creation of a mission statement to focus subsequent work and a framework and timeline for conducting this work. This mission statement highlights the primary and fundamental goal of improving life opportunities for all Indiana students by supporting instructional and assessment practices that improve achievement.

1. Mission

The Indiana statewide assessment system should represent a premier world assessment program that drives improved educational achievement for each of our students. Therefore, in response to HEA 1240 and to promote optimal academic achievement for all Indiana students, the Indiana State Board of Education endorses a system of assessments that fairly and accurately measures each student's achievement in relation to Indiana's Academic Standards. This assessment system shall be designed to meet all applicable state and federal laws and regulations and to yield clear and timely information that

- Supports high quality instruction for all students from pre-school through grade 12;
- Can be used to evaluate and improve educational programs and services; and
- Contributes to appropriate accountability decisions for schools and school corporations.

2. Framework and Process for Developing the HEA 1240 Requirements

HEA 1240 required the SBE to evaluate and possibly redesign the statewide assessment system. To guide this complex task and ensure comprehensive consideration of all critical elements, the SBE developed and applied the following framework for considering its current assessment system and any revisions to it.

1) Reporting and Use of Results

- a. To support high quality instruction for all students from pre-school through grade 12:
 - i. What assessment information would be most helpful and appropriate?
 - ii. What type of information about students' written communication would be most useful?
 - iii. How, when, and to whom should this information be provided?

- b. To support evaluation and improvement of educational programs and services:
 - i. What assessment information would be most helpful and appropriate?
 - ii. What type of information about students' written communication would be most useful?
 - iii. How, when, and to whom should this information be provided?
- c. To support appropriate accountability decisions for schools and school corporations:
 - i. What assessment information would be most helpful and appropriate?
 - ii. What type of information about students' written communication would be most useful?
 - iii. How, when, and to whom should this information be provided?

2) Technical Quality

- a. Test Design and Alignment
 - i. In terms of length (number of score points and testing time) and item-type (selected-response or constructed-response), what test design features would be most suitable for:
 - (a) Supporting high quality instruction for all students?
 - (b) Supporting evaluation and improvement of educational programs and services?
 - (c) Supporting appropriate accountability decisions for schools and school corporations?
 - ii. What level of information about students' knowledge and skills, from very detailed to more summative, is most suitable for:
 - (a) Supporting high quality instruction for all students?
 - (b) Supporting evaluation and improvement of educational programs and services?
 - (c) Supporting appropriate accountability decisions for schools and school corporations?
 - iii. How can alignment among assessments and standards/curricula be ensured in order to protect the validity of assessment information for each purpose?
 - iv. How can alignment among assessments and standards/curricula be ensured across grade levels?
- b. Comparability
 - i. What design characteristics and analyses are necessary to ensure the comparability of assessment information across students?
 - ii. What design characteristics and analyses are necessary to ensure the comparability of assessment information within grades over time?
 - iii. What design characteristics and analyses are necessary to support growth interpretations of assessment information across grades?
 - iv. What design characteristics and analyses are necessary to support appropriate interpretations of information across the current statewide assessments and new statewide assessments?
- c. Reliability and Accuracy of Scoring
 - i. How can scoring and reporting timelines be shortened without diminishing the accuracy and reliability of scores?

- ii. What are the time and cost implications for:
 - (a) Local versus distributed scoring of constructed-responses?
 - (b) Scoring models using various combinations of human raters and artificial intelligence?
 - (c) Various proportions of selected-response and constructed-response items?

3) Administration Options

- a. Computerized Administration Modes
 - i. How can on-line or other computerized administration options be implemented in ways that ensure equity of access for all students regardless of their special needs or school contexts?
 - ii. How can on-line or other computerized administration options be implemented in ways that ensure the comparability of scores across computerized and paper-and-pencil administration modes?
 - iii. How can paper-and-pencil and on-line or other computerized administration options be combined to support the most accessible and efficient administration of selected-response and constructed-response items?
 - iv. How can on-line or other computerized administration options be implemented in ways that ensure the security of test items and scores?
- b. What are the cost implications for:
 - i. Anticipated hardware, software, and connectivity requirements for on-line or other computerized administration options?
 - ii. Administration and scoring of various combinations of paper-and-pencil and on-line administration modes?
 - iii. Statewide administration at various points in the school year?

4) Assessment Literacy

- a. What information, materials, and other resources would be most useful in supporting appropriate interpretation and use of assessment information to support instruction?
- b. What types of professional development programming would be most effective in supporting appropriate interpretation and use of assessment information to support instruction?
- c. What types of pre-service training would be most effective in supporting appropriate interpretation and use of assessment information to support instruction?
- d. What information, materials, and other resources would be most useful in supporting high quality classroom assessment?

3. Timeline for Addressing HEA 1240

HEA1240-2006 required the Indiana State Board of Education to seek input from education stakeholders and to consider testing practices, products, and processes available elsewhere. The timeline and activities are summarized in Table 1. Related documents are provided in further appendices as indicated.

Table 1.

The Current System

Assessment	Administration Date	Type of Decision Results Inform				
		Instruction	Program Evaluation	Funding	Remediation or Graduation	Accountability
<i>District Assessments</i>	Varies	•	•			
<i>State Assessments</i>						
K-2 Reading		•				
ISTEP+ (Grades 3 – 9)	Fall	•	•	•	•	•
ISTEP+ Science (Grades 5,7)	Fall	•	•	•	•	○
GQE and GQE retests	Fall/Spring	•	•	•	•	•
ISTAR	(Fall)	•	•			•
CORE 40 EOC	Fall/Spring	•	•			•

○The science assessment is required under NCLB, but results do not have to be used for accountability purposes.

Table 2. Activities and Timeline for Addressing HEA 1240

Date	Participants	Topics and Tasks	Comments	Appendix
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Review HEA 1240	SBE members discussed HEA 1240 to ensure that its requirements were clear and commonly understood among all members.	
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Draft mission statement and timeline Consideration of federal assessment requirements	SBE members discussed the purpose of a statewide assessment system and created a preliminary timeline for addressing its requirements. SBE members considered the No Child Left Behind Peer Review Guidance for Standards and Assessments. This guidance is provide in Appendix B.	B
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Finalize mission statement and framework Testimony from Thomas Toch (April 21)	SBE members finalized the mission statement indicating the purpose of the statewide assessment system and drafted a framework of questions that must be addressed to ensure that recommendations in the HEA 1240 report would reflect a coherent approach to student assessment. Board members heard testimony from Thomas Toch from Education Sector, author of Margins of Error, a report on the current state of the student achievement testing industry. This report is included in Appendix C.	C
May 3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Finalize timeline	SBE members confirmed the timeline for subsequent HEA 1240 activities.	
May 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff • Representatives from Indiana stakeholder groups 	Gather input from Indiana education stakeholders	To ensure input from a variety of Indiana stakeholder groups, the SBE invited representatives from these groups to comment on specific aspects of a new statewide assessment system during an SBE meeting. Additional input was solicited on-line via the ISDE website. Input from these sources was compiled and presented during subsequent SBE meetings. Statements are provided in Appendix D.	D

Table 2. Activities and Timeline for Addressing HEA 1240 (continued)

Date	Participants	Topics and Tasks	Comments	Appendix
June 7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff • Testing Panelists 	Testimony from Testing Panelists Identification of major areas for vendor questions	Dr. Brian Gong, Director of the National Center for the Improvement of Education Assessment, spoke to the board on issues to consider in the redesign of state assessment systems. Dr. Kris Kaase, Associate Superintendent for the state of Mississippi, spoke to the board on his experience implementing a statewide formative assessment program. Information about these experts is provided in Appendix E. SBE members reviewed the transcripts from the focus groups and began to draft the questions that testing vendors would be asked to address.	E
June 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Approval of questions for vendors	SBE members finalized the Request for Information that was sent to testing vendors.	
By June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISDE staff 	Questions to vendors	The Request for Information was sent to testing vendors; the RFI is provided in Appendix F.	F
July 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff • Vendor Panelists 	Testimony from Vendors	Representatives from 14 testing vendors provided live testimony regarding their products and processes for delivering educational assessment tools. Vendors' presentation materials and written responses to the Request for Information are provided in Appendix G.	G

Table 2. Activities and Timeline for Addressing HEA 1240 (continued)

Date	Participants	Topics and Tasks	Comments	Appendix
August 8-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Outlining of report and requests for additional testimony	SBE members outlined the HEA 1240 report and discussed the additional information needed to finalize their recommended approach to redesigning the statewide assessment system	
September 6-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Testimony from education experts	SBE members heard testimony from Dr. W. James Popham, Professor Emeritus from the University of California at Los Angeles, and Dr. Larry Lezotte, Founder of Effective Schools Products, Ltd., on critical instruction issue related to educational assessment. Biographies for Drs. Popham and Lazotte appear in Appendix H.	H
		Review of draft report	SBE members reviewed and discussed the draft HEA 1240 report.	
October 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBE members • ISDE staff 	Review of final report	SBE reviewed and discussed the finalization of the HEA 1240 report.	
November 1		Report adopted for submission to the Budget Committee, the Legislative Council, and the Office of Management and Budget		